DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 721 SP 001 563

By-Coughlan, Robert J.

AN ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER WORK VALUES.

Pub Date Feb 68

Note-7p.; Paper presented before The American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, Feb., 1968.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.36

Descriptors-*BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, GOAL ORIENTATION, *INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, *MOTIVATION, STATUS NEED, *TEACHERS, *WORK ATTITUDES

Identifiers-David R. Saunders

This study sought to assess work values of school teachers through a 45-item, modified paired-comparison schedule, the Teacher Preference Audit, which was administered to 192 teachers in 4 middle-class, suburban high schools. Factor analysis of the data yielded 5 bipolar dimensions which accounted for 27.6% of total variance among all items. Beta-weighted mean scores of teachers on each factor were subjected to David R. Saunders' method of pattern or profile analysis. The results of this analysis plus an examination of written responses by teachers to questions about their achievements and aspirations resulted in identification of 5 types of teachers: (1) subject oriented, (2) staff oriented, (3) system oriented, (4) supervision oriented, and (5) socially oriented. Nearly half of the total sample of teachers fell into a marginal or "mixed" orientation category, perhaps due to (1) the extent of professionalization of school teaching, (2) the extent of bureaucratization of schools as an institution, and (3) the interpenetration of bureaucratic and professional principles in the formal organizational structure of schools. Since nearly half of the sample group was not classifiable, it seems that a satisfactory conceptualization and measurement of work values associated with school teaching has yet to be accomplished. (SG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER WORK VALUES

by
Robert J. Coughlan
Associate Professor of Education
Northwestern University

Paper presented before
The American Educational Research Association
Chicago, February, 1968

8P001563

ED022721

AN ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER WORK VALUES

Robert J. Coughlan
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

This study was concerned with assessing the work values of school teachers. The concept of work values was used as a way of describing the different value-orientations brought into the work situation by the teachers.[1] Theory and previous research on professional work groups in formal organization had suggested as relevant the following clusters of values:

1. Professional Values--held by teachers who identify themselves with the values and goals of professionalism, knowledge and education, and their field of specialization.

2. Organizational Values--held by teachers who identify themselves with the values and goals of bureaucracy, conformity to system policy and rules, and promotion to supervisory positions.

3. Social Values--held by teachers who identify themselves with the values and goals of their work group, home and family, and religion and convention.

INSTRUMENTATION

A 45-item, modified paired-comparison schedule, called the Teacher Preference Audit, was constructed to measure teacher work values. The TPA was administered to a total of 192 teachers in four middle-class, suburban high schools. The data from this administration were factor analyzed to determine and describe the different types of items in the audit. The factor analysis yielded five bi-polar dimensions which accounted for 27.6 percent of the total variance among all items. Beta-weighted mean scores of teachers on each of the factors were subsequently subjected to Saunders' method of pattern or profile analysis.[2] The results of this analysis, coupled with an examination of comments written by the teachers in response to questions about

---

[1] The term "work values" denotes the primary identification of teachers with the value systems underlying bureaucracy, professionalism, or the informal work group.

[2] David R. Saunders and Helen Schucman, "Syndrome Analysis: An Efficient Procedure for Isolating Meaningful Subgroups in a Non-random Sample of a Population." Paper presented at the Third Annual Meeting of the Psychonomic Society, St. Louis, Missouri, 1962. (Mimeograph.)

their achievements and aspirations, provided bases for the identification and naming of five types of teachers with respect to work values.

The five types were essentially consistent with the Professional, Organizational, and Social orientations posited by the constructs of the research. However, the findings sharpened the Professional and Organizational types by indicating that finer distinctions could be made than those which were explicitly proposed. Specifically, Professionals divided into Subject- and Staff-oriented teachers. Organizationals split into System- and Supervisory-oriented teachers. Socials remained substantially the same as was postulated and were called Socially-oriented teachers. A sixth group of residual, mixed, or Marginal teachers, who comprised nearly half of the total sample, was also identified.

The five types were defined as follows:

1. SUBJECT-ORIENTED teachers identify themselves primarily with the subject matter of their field of specialization. Operating within this framework, they strive to extend their knowledge on what appears to them to be broad, complicated, and important fronts. They are more concerned about their independence and autonomy in the school than about their official or social status. Their contacts with superordinates, follow teachers, and students are generally work-oriented; their emphasis is on the subject matter of their specialty or on intellectual matters; and their communication is somewhat formal and infrequent.

2. STAFF-ORIENTED teachers are concerned primarily with the orientation, control, and evaluation of the teacher work group. They perceive their role as one of guiding and facilitating group efforts on such task-related matters as identifying student needs, formulating instructional goals, establishing standards, and promoting teacher welfare. They believe that final authority in educational matters should reside in the considered judgement of their colleague group. They work closely with peers as members of a team, discussing issues, explaining problems, and listening for suggestions which they may then communicate to officials in the hierarchy.

3. SYSTEM-ORIENTED teachers identify themselves primarily with the goals and values of bureaucracy. They feel a deep responsibility to conform to system policy and rules so as to strengthen and enhance the bureaucratic administration. They rely on the hierarchy of officials for guidance and support in their work and derive personal security through strict adherence to their directives. In relating to students and parents, they depend on the formal power of their position and on the prestige of rules for their authority. Their relations with fellow teachers tend to be distant and impersonal.

4. SUPERVISORY-ORIENTED teachers model themselves after authority figures in the administrative hierarchy who epitomize their dominant values and career orientation. They engage frequently in school leadership activities in order to gain the attention of superordinates, improve the system, and develop their supervisory skills. Sensitive to the individual goals, abilities, and ambitions of students and fellow teachers, they channel their efforts into educational activities where achievement will gain them recognition. In relating to superordinates and parents, they are diplomatic and somewhat manipulative in situations which may redound to their self-advancement.

5. SOCIALLY-ORIENTED teachers are interested primarily in the social development and integration of the teacher work group and in the gratification of the personal and social needs of students. They are concerned with their social status and show solidarity, give help, and raise the status of others as a means of gaining popularity and promoting harmonious social relations in the school. They feel a deep responsibility to adhere to the group's informal norms for behavior. Motivated strongly by altruistic, familial, and religious values, their contacts with fellow teachers, parents and students are frequent, warm, and unselfish.

PROPORTIONS OF SOCIAL TYPES IN THE SAMPLE

The finding that nearly half of the total sample of teachers fell into the Marginal or "mixed" orientation category presented problems of interpretation. No provision was made in the study for further identifying or sorting out the Marginals. In lieu of further empirical research, the whole issue was placed in the context of three theoretical considerations: the extent of professionalization of school teaching; (2) the extent of bureaucratization of schools as an institution, and (3) the interpenetration of bureaucratic and professional principles in the formal organizational structure of schools. Within this framework, it was concluded that the finding of a high proportion of mixed value types can be adequately explained theoretically. Moreover, it corresponds to other empirical findings concerning the work values of related professional groups, e.g., lawyers, engineers, and college professors.

With respect to the first consideration, school teaching was defined as a profession for analytical purposes. However, this classification is debatable. In the main, elementary and secondary teachers are not considered to be part of the establishment of professions as are, for instance, college professors, M.D.'s,

lawyers, architects, or civil engineers. Wilensky categorizes school teaching as a "borderline case," grouping it with such occupations striving toward professionalization as librarianship, nursing, pharmacy, and optometry.[1]

Consequently, in an occupation which is not yet a profession a serious question can be raised as to whether many of its members have ever had the opportunity --either during training or on the job-- to be socialized into a truly professional work role. As a result, relatively few teachers might be expected to affiliate themselves with professional principles.

With respect to the second consideration, the degree of bureaucratization of the typical public school has been questioned by a number of authorities. Miles, for example, compared classical bureaucratic principles with specialized features he found in schools and concluded that the Weberian model was particularly inappropriate for educational enterprises.[2] The special properties he discusses, i.e., variability of input (teacher and pupil variability), ambiguity of output (in goals and measurable results), system vulnerability to community pressure, low role visibility and interdependence on the part of teachers, all contrast sharply with principles of bureaucratic rationality. Whereas the occupation of school teaching may not provide a clear-cut model of professionalism for purposes of teacher identification, likewise teachers may not have at their disposal in the work place a vivid image of bureaucratic principles with which they might affiliate themselves. As a result, relatively few teachers might be expected to identify themselves with bureaucratic values and goals.

---

[1]Harold L. Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, LXX (September, 1964), 142.

[2]Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Richard O. Carlson et.al., Change Processes in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1965), pp. 11-34.

Finally, the interpenetration of bureaucratic and professional principles in the formal organizational framework of the school provides a mechanism for the development of "mixed" structures. This in turn may account for the high proportion of mixed types of teacher work values. Wilensky writes of the cultures of bureaucracy and professionalism as having "invaded" one another in complex organization and concludes:

> To understand the future of professionalism we must grasp the diversity of orientations that now prevail among men with high levels of training and link these orientations to specific attributes of occupation and work place. If interpenetration of various "bureaucratic" and "professional" cultures is taking place, the individual role orientations appropriate to each should also merge: mixed cultures should be reflected in mixed attitudes of professional people.[1]

Pursuing this thesis, Wilensky devised two indices which purport to measure professional-discipline orientation ("Whose judgement of professional performance should count the most?") and careerist orientation ("Things most important in a job"). Among a probability sample of lawyers, engineers, and professors stratified for various personal and social characteristics, he found as predicted that the two indices were negatively correlated ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$). Those who rated themselves high on careerism seldom rated themselves high on professionalism.

However, taking into account the entire range of scores for all groups, Wilensky was also impressed by the fact that the inverse relationship was not strong. Accordingly, he concluded that "mixed types of orientation are typical, consistent with the idea of the interpenetration of bureaucratic and professional cultures."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 150.

[2] Ibid., p. 153. Underlining added. His findings also indicate that professional training is more influential than job indoctrination as a source of role orientation. This would imply that teachers who fail to identify themselves with professional values as the result of training are even less likely to do so later on the job.

CONCLUSION

The original formulation of teacher work values seems to reflect a basic classification of motives and character types. For example, there is a rather close correspondence between Riesman's inner-directedness (emphasis on individual internalized goals) and the Professional type; between tradition-directedness (emphasis on social interaction) and the Social type.[1] The types can also be likened broadly to Freud's concepts of the super-ego (Organizational), ego (Professional) and id (Social), provided the functional and not the topographical aspects of the conceptualization are kept in mind.[2]

Notwithstanding, the measurements and procedure used to subdivide the total sample of 192 teachers into work value subsets showed that nearly half of the group was not classifiable into one of the five basic types that emerged from the data, i.e., two types of Professionals, two types of Organizationals, and one Social type. This would seem to indicate that a satisfactory conceptualization and measurement of the work values associated with school teaching has yet to be accomplished. The questions as to what values are most important to teachers and how they come to obtain, retain, and change them remain unanswered and should serve as an important subject for investigation in future research.

---

[1]David Riesman, The Lonely Crowd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

[2]Sigmund Freud, New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1933).